

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated December 8, 2010.

Claims 1 and 14 are amended; claims 23-31 are canceled, without prejudice to or disclaimer by the Applicant; as a result, claims 1-22 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the learned Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification page 1 lines 10-13 (field of invention); page 6 lines 16-17; page 7 line 24 and continuing through page 12.

The Rejection of Claims Under § 103

Claims 1-3, 7-17, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makarios et al. (US Patent 6,401,125) in view of Green et al. (US Patent 6,003,084) in view of Sandhu et al. (US Patent 6,985,953) in view of Mohan et al. (US Patent 6,505,230). Obviousness requires that each and every element be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

The Mohan reference in the combination was cited for purposes of showing cookie management by a service on behalf of an origin server and a client. This aspect of the claims was not shown or suggested in the remaining references of the combination.

The Mohan reference achieves the management of the cookies and the intermediary actions for the cookies using a client component that is specific to a client. In many cases, the client component is actually installed on the client. Mohan column 4 lines 1-5. This connection module (client component) is needed for interaction if a client directly contacts a remote server and it needs to be installed on the client to interface with the proxy. In cases where a client contacts the proxy first, the client component resides on the proxy and is used to establish a connection with the client. This processing is not a transparent proxy configuration; rather it is a classic forward proxy configuration because the client needs special software to handle the interactions with the proxy. Moreover, in the other case where the client component is not installed on the client, the scenario cannot warrant a transparent proxy situation because the client directly contacts the proxy and logs into it (so the proxy is not transparent by any means).

The Examiner is invited to review the following reference locations in Mohan for this presented interpretation of Mohan: column 4 lines 1-28; column 4 line 63 and continuing to column 5 line 3; and column 14 line 66 and continuing to column 67 line 10.

Essentially, either the client component is pre-installed on the client to modify HTTP interactions or the client directly contacts the proxy, in either case Mohan is not a transparent proxy but a classic forward proxy and Mohan requires specialized software for the clients to provide its cookie management.

This is now what Applicant has done where there is no specialized client software or proxy software at all in Applicant's transparent proxy approach and all interactions are taken care of using existing protocols used by the client and the proxy. This level of integration is not possible with the proprietary approach of Mohan and this level of integration is also not shown in the remaining references of record. Applicant has amended the independent claims to reflect these distinctions.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of record be withdrawn and the claims in question allowed.

Claims 4, 6, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makarios et al. in view of Green et al. in view of Sandhu et al. in view of Mohan et al. as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Callaghan et al. (US Patent Publication US 2002/0007317). In view of the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the independent claims, this rejection should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same from the learned Examiner.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makarios et al. in view of Green et al., in view of Sandhu et al., in view of Mohan et al. in view of Callaghan et al. as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Birrell et al. (US Patent 5,805,803). In view of the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the independent claims, this rejection should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same from the learned Examiner.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.


If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402--0938
(513) 942-0224

Date 03-08-2011

By /



Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535